

From: [Bob G. McCoy](#)
To: [Ruth F. Maron](#)
Cc: [Tanya D. Ellis](#); [Mitch McGuffey](#)
Subject: RE: WI-Spatz - Case No. 16-cv-726
Date: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 9:23:23 AM

Ruth - There is an objection - the same as for Kilty. Subject to preserving the objections, an agreed order that the Kilty order will control in Spatz is to me the best route.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruth F. Maron [<mailto:Ruth.Maron@formanwatkins.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 7:13 AM
To: Bob G. McCoy
Cc: Tanya D. Ellis; Mitch McGuffey
Subject: Re: WI-Spatz - Case No. 16-cv-726

Bob,

Do you have any objection to our requesting a stay in Spatz?

Thanks,

Ruth F. Maron

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 27, 2016, at 10:39 AM, Ruth F. Maron
<Ruth.Maron@formanwatkins.com<<mailto:Ruth.Maron@formanwatkins.com>>> wrote:

Bob,

As in Kilty, we are preparing to file a motion to stay the Spatz matter pending resolution of the appeals to the Seventh Circuit in the other Marshfield cases. As Judge Conley noted in his order granting a stay in Kilty, the legal issues on appeal are potentially dispositive of claims raised in this case.

With this in mind, would you agree to a stay until the Seventh Circuit has ruled on the appellate issues? OI and 3M have no objections to a stay.

Please let us know of your thoughts on this before Thursday.

Thanks,

Ruth

Ruth F. Maron
Forman Watkins & Krutz LLP
200 South Lamar Street, Suite 100
Jackson, Mississippi 39201-4099
D: 601.973.5982 | F: 601.960.8613
ruth.maron@formanwatkins.com<<mailto:ruth.maron@formanwatkins.com>>
<image001.png><<http://www.formanwatkins.com/>>